SB761
.U7
S7
no.
85-10

LIBRARY FILE COPY
INTERMOUNTAIN STATION

WESTFORNET
MONTHLY ALERT
Edition NOV 1985
Item No. 89
File ~~SD 11 A57 Fle no. 85-10~~

United States Department of Agriculture
**Forest Service**
Southwestern Region

# Forest Pest Management Report

R-3 85-10

## INCIDENCE, SEVERITY, AND GROWTH LOSSES ASSOCIATED WITH PONDEROSA PINE DWARF MISTLETOE ON THE APACHE-SITGREAVES NATIONAL FORESTS, ARIZONA

May 1985

3420

R-3 85-10

# INCIDENCE, SEVERITY, AND GROWTH LOSSES ASSOCIATED WITH PONDEROSA PINE DWARF MISTLETOE ON THE APACHE-SITGREAVES NATIONAL FORESTS, ARIZONA

May 1985

By

Paul F. Hessburg, Jerome S. Beatty
and Robert E. Wood

USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region
State and Private Forestry
Forest Pest Management
517 Gold Avenue, SW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge Rick Norris, Randy Pair, and Randy Sosa for their capable assistance in conducting the survey. Rick Norris was responsible for supervising and organizing the survey crews, preparing the graphics, and the timely completion of the survey; Randy Pair was responsible for preparing the field maps used in the survey and assisted in much of the data collection. We gratefully acknowledge the comments and critical review of this manuscript by Frank Hawksworth, Dave Johnson, Bill Jacobi, Milo Larson, Jerry Jeansonne, Dick Bassett, Joe Prosser, and Marlin Hughes.

## ABSTRACT

Forest stands adjacent to eight hundred and eighty-eight miles of forest road were surveyed on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests in 1983 to determine the incidence and severity of dwarf mistletoe infection in the commercial ponderosa pine forest cover type. The survey data provided a basis for estimating the magnitude of growth losses associated with dwarf mistletoe. Fifty-two percent of the surveyed stands were mistletoe infected. Of the infected stands, 21 percent had less than one-third of the trees in the managed age class infected, 38 percent of the infected stands had one-third to two-thirds of the trees infected, and 42 percent of the stands had more than two-thirds of the trees in the managed age class infected. Forest-wide, 14,205 acres were surveyed; survey miles and acres were distributed proportionally across all stand size and visual quality classes. Chi-square analyses indicated that there were several significant relationships between stand size classes, visual quality classes, and dwarf mistletoe incidence and severity (P=0.05). On the Chevelon Ranger District, both stand size and visual quality classes were significantly correlated with higher dwarf mistletoe incidence and severity.

A previous Region-wide dwarf mistletoe survey, conducted between 1954-57 (Andrews and Daniels 1960), indicated that 33 percent of the ponderosa pine stands on the Sitgreaves National Forest and 46 percent of the stands on the Apache National Forest were infected, for a combined weighted average of 41 percent incidence for the two Forests. Results from the 1983 survey indicate that dwarf mistletoe incidence has increased 11 percent in the last 25 to 30 years on the two Forests.

Total growth losses were estimated for the Forests using incidence and severity data from the 1983 survey and RMYLD2 growth and yield simulations. When timber management, silviculture, and dwarf mistletoe control were simultaneously optimized in the simulations, the most conservative estimate of annual loss in sawtimber at the current level of incidence was 30.9 MMBF per year. The corresponding annual loss estimate in pulpwood yield was 7.0 MMCF per year. Small changes in data input into RMYLD2 reflecting changes in timber management emphasis (i.e., focus on nontimber resource objectives), silvicultural prescriptions, or dwarf mistletoe control cutting methods, produced large increases in the annual loss estimates. We estimate the annual losses in sawtimber and pulpwood growth and yield to be 60 to 90 MMBF and 14 to 18 MMCF, respectively.


## INTRODUCTION

Rocky Mountain ponderosa pine (Pinus ponderosa var. scopulorum Engelm.) grows on an estimated 11 million acres in the Southwestern United States. In Arizona and New Mexico, 2.5 million acres are regarded as being commercially productive (growth $\geq$20 $ft^3$ per acre per year). On the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests, 89 percent of the acres of commercial timberland are in the ponderosa pine forest cover type, accounting for an equivalent proportion of the annual harvest volume for these Forests.

Region-wide, over one-third (36%) of the commercial ponderosa pine resource is dwarf mistletoe infected (Arceuthobium vaginatum subsp. cryptopodum (Engelm.) Hawks. and Wiens); by forest, estimates of infection levels range from 15 percent to nearly 65 percent (Andrews and Daniels 1960). Volume losses associated with ponderosa pine dwarf mistletoe are primarily growth losses. By comparison, losses caused by other important disease pests of ponderosa pine, most notably the root rot pathogens Armillaria mellea and Heterobasidion annosum, are related to tree mortality.

The apparent increase in incidence and severity of dwarf mistletoe in southwestern ponderosa pine has been of particular concern to forest pathologists. Observations suggest that stands with histories of repeated selective harvest exhibit the greatest increase in dwarf mistletoe infection severity; data to confirm or disprove this contention have been lacking. The objectives of this evaluation were to: (1) Compare present dwarf mistletoe incidence in the ponderosa pine forest cover type with that found in the 1954-57 survey on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests, (2) determine if changes in dwarf mistletoe incidence and severity are related to stand size class or visual quality classifications, and (3) estimate annual growth losses caused by ponderosa pine dwarf mistletoe by Ranger District and Forest-wide.

## METHODS

Roadside Survey. This evaluation used the survey methods of Andrews and Daniels (1960), Merrill et al. (1985), and Johnson et al. (1984). Roadside survey-sampling methods were deemed appropriate to this problem analysis, since the spread of dwarf mistletoe is not correlated with the presence or impact of forest roading.

The survey determined dwarf mistletoe incidence and severity by combinations of forest cover type, stand size class, and visual quality class. All passable National Forest System roads on each Ranger District were surveyed. Mistletoe data were collected only from acres of ponderosa pine classified as tentatively suitable in the land management planning process. Forest cover type and stand size class of stands adjacent to roads were determined from land management planning, forest cover type maps. The 16 original stand condition classes (FSH 2409.26d, dated November 1975) were condensed for simplification to form 5 broader stand size classes:

Seedlings and saplings (SS); combining 01, 14, and 15
(>4 inches tall; <5.0 inches d.b.h.)

Poletimber (PT); combining 02, 04, 06, 08, 10, and 12
(5.0 to 8.9 inches d.b.h.)

Sawtimber (ST); combining 03, 05, 07, 09, and 13
(9.0 inches and larger)

Overmature timber (OT); 11
(Old growth)

Nonstocked (NS); 16

Sensitivity levels and visual quality objectives (FSH 2383.1; Agriculture Handbook 462; FSH 2383.16) were combined to reduce the number of visual quality classes, since management practices do not change significantly between some levels. The seven combined classes were:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Foreground retention | (FR) |
| 2. | Other retention | (OR) |
| 3. | Foreground partial retention | (FPR) |
| 4. | Level 3 partial retention | (3PR) |
| 5. | Other partial retention | (OPR) |
| 6. | Level 3 modification | (3M) |
| 7. | Other modification | (OM) |

Visual resource inventory maps (scale 2.64 or 2.0 inches=1 mile) were used to indicate current boundaries of visual quality classes. Changes in forest cover type, stand size class, and visual quality class were clearly marked on survey maps and those maps are archived as a permanent record of the survey.

Two-person crews drove selected roads at speeds not exceeding 10 miles per hour and observed a strip 2 chains wide, measured from the edge of the right-of-way, parallel to the right side of the road. Changes in forest cover type, stand size class, visual quality class, and dwarf mistletoe severity were visually estimated and recorded to the nearest 0.10 mile using the survey vehicles' odometer. Dwarf mistletoe (DM) infection severity was measured in stands as follows:

DM0=No visible infestation in stands.

DM1=Less than one-third of the trees in the managed age class infected.

DM2=One-third to two-thirds of the trees in the managed age class infected.

DM3=More than two-thirds of the trees in the managed age class infected.

At the beginning of the survey, transects 1 chain wide by 2 chains long, perpendicular to the road axis, were established every mile in which infected and uninfected trees in the managed age class were tallied to correct ocular estimates of infection severity. The number of transects gradually decreased as survey crews developed expertise in estimating infection severity.

Survey results were expressed as the ratio of miles traveled adjacent to infected stands to the total miles traveled Forest-wide, by District, stand size class, visual quality class, and dwarf mistletoe infection severity level. A record of the roads surveyed and direction traveled for each road can be found in Figures 6-12 of the Appendix.

Growth Loss Estimations. If all stands on the Forests were mistletoe free, that would represent full volume productivity or potential. It is not now, nor will it ever be feasible to reach the mistletoe free state. It is feasible however, to reduce mistletoe infection severity in stands so that impact on full volume productivity is negligible. The comparison of full productive potential to existing conditions is useful for assessing the magnitude of the problem. In generating sawtimber and pulpwood volume loss estimates, stands representative of the four forested stand size classes (i.e., seedlings and saplings, poletimber, sawtimber, and overmature timber) were projected to rotation age (120 years) using RMYLD2 (Edminster 1978) at the midpoint of each of the four infection severity levels.

Each stand size class was assigned a nominal age:

| | |
|---|---|
| Seedlings and saplings | =20 years |
| Poletimber | =50 years |
| Sawtimber | =100 years |
| Overmature timber | =200 years |

Site index values of 60, 70, and 80 feet (100-year index age) were used in the growth and yield simulations to reflect the range of growing conditions extant on the Forests. Growing stock levels (GSL's) were adjusted whenever possible to reflect site productivity, optimize volume production and product size, and achieve effective dwarf mistletoe control. Differences in yield for stands managed to rotation at each infection severity level represented the impact on volume production attributable to dwarf mistletoe. RMYLD2 output was expressed in yields per acre; losses were assessed by subtracting infected from healthy stand yields. Losses are reported for each District surveyed by stand size class. Acres of tentatively suitable forest land by forest cover type and stand size class were obtained

for the Forests from the 1979 Regional assessment and were also extrapolated from the survey. From the 1979 assessment, the total acres of commercial ponderosa pine = 810,837 acres.

Commercial acres by stand size class: (percentages based on survey extrapolations)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Seedlings and saplings | = 348,660 | acres (43%) |
| Poletimber | = 267,576 | acres (33%) |
| Sawtimber | = 145,951 | acres (18%) |
| Overmature timber | = 40,542 | acres (05%) |
| Nonstocked | = 0 | acres (0%) |

Seedling, sapling, and poletimber stands were managed to a 120-year rotation age beginning at 20 and 50 years, respectively. For sawtimber and overmature timber stands, future growth losses to dwarf mistletoe were considered minor; since stand regeneration was imminent for these stands, the understory component was managed to rotation on RMYLD2. For sawtimber stands, the seedlings and saplings stand size class was simulated; for overmature timber stands, the poletimber stand size class was simulated. The underlying assumption used in sawtimber and overmature timber simulations was equivalent infection levels in the overstory and understory components. Optimum silvicultural prescriptions by site index, stand size class, and dwarf mistletoe infection severity level are shown on Tables 1 and 2.

For all RMYLD2 simulations, dwarf mistletoe infection severity levels (DM) were set at the midpoint of their range:

DM0 = 0 percent infection = PINF 0 ; DMLEV=3.0

DM1 = 16.5 percent infection = PINF 16.5; DMLEV=3.0

DM2 = 49.5 percent infection = PINF 49.5; DMLEV=3.0

DM3 = 82.5 percent infection = PINF 82.5; DMLEV=6.0

(PINF is the equivalent RMYLD2 input variable)

To arrive at estimates of potential volume production for DM3=82.5 percent infection, DMLEV was set at 6.0 (DMLEV is the input variable in RMYLD2 that indicates the dwarf mistletoe rating (DMR) above which thinnings will not be performed (Edminster 1978; Hawksworth 1977).

## RESULTS

Dwarf mistletoe was found in 52 percent of the ponderosa pine stands on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests. Of the 887.8 miles surveyed, 466 miles were mistletoe infected. A total of 14,205 acres were surveyed, equal to 1.75 percent sampling intensity. Dwarf mistletoe incidence and severity were among the highest seen in the Region to date. Table 3 shows dwarf mistletoe incidence and severity by stand size class and District. Mistletoe incidence was greatest on the Springerville and Chevelon Districts and least on the Lakeside District; the Clifton District was not surveyed because of the lack of commercially suitable acres. Table 4 shows mistletoe infection severity combining all stands in each District; it is a condensation of Table 3. On the Springerville District, two-thirds of the stands are mistletoe infected, and over 50 percent of all stands on the District are between one-third and two-thirds infected (Figure 1). Dwarf mistletoe infection severity is increasing in stands on the Springerville District. On the Chevelon District, stand infection levels are nearly as high. Mistletoe is present in over 50 percent of the stands on the Alpine and Heber Districts; with respect to the latter, over 60 percent of the infected stands have mistletoe in more than two-thirds of the trees. The Lakeside District was least affected with a little over one-third of the stands mistletoe infected.

Table 5 shows dwarf mistletoe incidence by visual quality class, and Table 6 gives incidence by visual quality class and infection severity level. The Springerville and Chevelon Districts show a higher level of dwarf mistletoe incidence related to visual quality class. High mistletoe incidence was most often related to the foreground, other retention, and foreground partial retention visual quality classes, but, in many cases, trends were not statistically significant. In the level 3 modification and other modification classes, where retention and esthetics are deemphasized by timber objectives, dwarf mistletoe incidence significantly exceeded the average 50 percent of the time on the Chevelon, Springerville, and Alpine Ranger Districts.

Chi-square analyses, comparing observed and expected mistletoe infection levels by stand size classes and visual quality classes, revealed several significant relationships (Table 7). On the Chevelon District, there were significant ($P=0.05$) changes in dwarf mistletoe incidence related to stand size classes and visual quality classes; in seedlings and saplings, and sawtimber stands, timber management activities have significantly reduced mistletoe, while significantly increasing mistletoe incidence in poletimber stands by 11.5 percent (Figure 2). With respect to changing mistletoe incidence related to visual quality classification, significant increases ($P=0.05$) have occurred in the foreground retention, other retention, and level 3 partial retention classes, with a concurrent reduction in mistletoe in the other modification class (Figure 3). On the Heber District, mistletoe has increased significantly (i.e., 10%) in seedling and sapling stands and decreased equivalently in sawtimber stands (Table 7). Significant reductions in mistletoe were observed in foreground retention stands on the Alpine and Lakeside Districts, with a

large increase (10%) in foreground partial retention stands on the Lakeside District as well. On the Springerville District, there were no significant relationships between mistletoe incidence and stand size classes or visual quality classes.

Estimates of annual growth loss by District are summarized in Table 8. These estimates are not based on simulating current management conditions but are an expression of growth losses to dwarf mistletoe under the best circumstances, when silviculture and dwarf mistletoe control are optimized coincidentally and all infected stands are entered immediately. A sawtimber-loss estimate of 30.9 MMBF per year Forest-wide is the most conservative estimate when mistletoe incidence is at the 52-percent level (Figure 4). Since all stands cannot be entered immediately, current sawtimber losses on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests exceed 60 MMBF per year and may run as high as 90 MMBF per year. This is confirmed in yield projections that allow delayed entry. A comparable inflation applies to cubic foot volume losses as well (i.e., 14-18 MMCF per year).

Based on the results of their 1954-57 mistletoe survey, Andrews and Daniels (1960) concluded that 33 percent of the commercial ponderosa pine stands on the Sitgreaves National Forest were infected with dwarf mistletoe, and 46 percent of the stands in the Apache National Forest were likewise infected. These estimates were based on a plot survey; 440 plots were taken on the 2 Forests. We analyzed the unpublished data from their roadside survey, from that same period, and found that it corroborated the results of their plot survey. We feel that the older plot and roadside survey information is accurate and it serves as an appropriate yardstick upon which to evaluate the results of this current survey. Dwarf mistletoe incidence has increased from 41 to 52 percent in 25 to 30 years on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (Figure 5).

## DISCUSSION

The results of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey indicate a real trend of increasing incidence and severity. We attribute much of the increased incidence (11 percent) to 25 or more years of selective harvesting. The propensity to prescribe preparatory cuts in succession where seedcuts or final removals were needed, has perpetuated unevenaged stand conditions and increased the rate of spread of the disease. Past management emphasis was inappropriate to reducing dwarf mistletoe; cutting out the volume was most important. Trees that were selected for harvest were scattered throughout stands and usually were the largest and healthiest individuals. What remained after each selective harvest was a higher proportion of inferior quality, mistletoe infected trees. Openings created by selective removals were naturally regenerated, stands were unevenaged and multi-storied, and dwarf mistletoe spread quickly into the new understory. We surmise that a portion of the increase in dwarf mistletoe incidence is real increase (i.e., new infection of previously healthy trees), but perhaps an equally important portion is that which has resulted from increasing the diseased proportion in stands by selective harvesting.

The increased incidence and severity of dwarf mistletoe infection on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests is significant, and management objectives should reflect a concerted effort to reduce dwarf mistletoe effects on growth and yield. Unchecked, the mistletoe problem will worsen and the magnitude of associated growth losses will increase. The trend can be reversed through improvement in silvicutural treatments.

In general, dwarf mistletoe spreads most slowly in single-story, even-aged stands of any age. Small departures from even-aged management result in radical increases in dwarf mistletoe incidence and severity. In the RMYLD2 growth and yield simulations that were used to estimate volume losses, stocking was drastically reduced in infected stands at the earliest possible time to reduce stand DMR's. Without this early reduction in stocking, stands were destroyed by dwarf mistletoe before rotation age. Volume loss estimates assume that thinning entries or regeneration cuts were made in every stand at the most opportune time. Departures from this management strategy resulted in reductions in timber yield much worse than reported here.

In addition to documenting mistletoe incidence, severity, and associated growth losses, it is intended that these survey results will draw to a focus the scope and principal causes of the problem, so that corrective timber management decisions can be made to reverse the trend of increasing mistletoe severity on the Forests.

The principal causes as we see them are:

1. A repeated history of selective harvesting in dwarf mistletoe infected stands.

2. Silvicultural prescriptions that perpetuated unevenaged stand conditions. The ponderosa pine cover type consisted of a mosaic of unevenaged clumps of trees. Following selective overstory removals portions of every stand were naturally regenerated. Seedcuts were rare and total overstory removals almost nonexistent.

3. Lack of priority given to treating mistletoe-infected stands. Entire timber sale areas were selectively harvested to produce a targeted volume. Little thought was given to delineating specific cutting units for the primary purpose of controlling dwarf mistletoe. By giving mistletoe-infected stands high treatment priority in timber sales, two major works could be accomplished: (a) The targeted volume could be realized from fewer acres and (b) greater volume would be produced in properly treated stands that could be harvested in subsequent entries.

4. Ineffective cutting methods when dwarf mistletoe was the intended object of silvicultural prescriptions. Visibly infected overstory trees were removed but trees with little evidence of witches' broom formation were retained in the overstory. Seeds discharged from mistletoe plants in the residual overstory trees provided the inoculum source for further overstory and understory infections. In most cases, a seedcut and overstory removal, followed by judicious thinning in the understory would have reduced the presence of the dwarf mistletoe in stands to acceptable levels.

5. Lack of a consistent approach or policy for controlling dwarf mistletoe in stands of all sizes. Table 3 shows the breakdown of dwarf mistletoe infection severity by size class; Table 7 indicates those increments and decrements that are significant. On Table 3, mistletoe incidence in seedling and sapling stands equals Forest-wide mistletoe incidence. Incidence in sawtimber stands is much less than the Forest-wide estimate. Statistical analysis indicates that the reduction in mistletoe incidence in sawtimber stands is significantly greater than could be predicted. Timber entries have reduced the dwarf mistletoe incidence in sawtimber stands. Of greatest importance is the level of mistletoe incidence in poletimber Forest-wide. Sixty percent of the poletimber stands are infected and nearly half of these are more than two-thirds infected. Since one-third of the commercial land base for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests is in poletimber stands (see page 6), a considerable proportion of the future volume production is expected to be generated by these stands. Without proper control, that volume cannot be realized. Three-quarter's of the commercial land base for the two Forests is in seedling, sapling, and poletimber stands; 50 to 60 percent of the stands are currently mistletoe infected.

6. Lack of an effective policy for controlling dwarf mistletoe in visually sensitive areas. Table 6 shows the breakdown of dwarf mistletoe infection severity by visual quality class; Table 7 indicates those increments and decrements that are significant. The most visually sensitive visual quality class and least impacted by timber management entries is the foreground retention class. We might expect that dwarf mistletoe incidence in these stands would be greatest because they are not entered for management to retain their visual integrity. On the contrary, dwarf mistletoe incidence is lowest in foreground retention stands. We surmise that the lack of timber management entries in these stands has reduced or eliminated the potential for mistletoe enhancement by selective harvesting. In the other retention visual quality classes (OR, FPR, and 3PR) where visual sensitivity is of considerable importance, dwarf mistletoe incidence consistently exceeds the Forest-wide level. Timber entries are allowed in these stands but timber harvesting methods that will effectively control dwarf mistletoe are not utilized at the Forest level because they are considered visually unacceptable.

The growth losses estimated and presented reflect the level of damage and loss associated with mistletoe at the present level of incidence. Losses will decrease with reductions in the number and distribution of infected trees in stands. The solution to the problem lies in improving stand management by treating infected stands first, thereby reducing mistletoe incidence in stands, one stand at a time. It is important that mistletoe incidence routinely becomes a major decision variable when stand treatments are prioritized and cutting units are selected in timber sales. Prescriptions need to reflect a major emphasis of reducing stand DMR, while trying to reflect stocking, spacing, and tree diameter objectives. Dwarf mistletoe is endemic in southwestern ponderosa pine forests, but its impact can be reduced with proper management so that the effects are negligible.

Chapter 70 in the Cutting Methods Handbook (FSH 2409.26a, dated December 1984) was prepared as a field aid for dealing with mistletoe-infected stands. Information is given on rating infected trees and whole stands, and methods are presented which aid in the complex process of determining which cutting units should be entered and which can be deferred. Sections on regeneration and intermediate cutting methods are also included. Much of the time these materials will provide the necessary guidance. If additional technical assistance is needed, pathologists in the Regional Office are available to help evaluate mistletoe problems and assist in formulating prescriptions to control dwarf mistletoe in specific cutting units.

## LITERATURE CITED


Andrews, S. R., and V. P. Daniels. 1960. A survey of dwarf mistletoes in Arizona and New Mexico. USDA Forest Serv., Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Exp. Sta., Sta. Paper No. 49. 17 p.

Edminster, C. B. 1978. RMYLD: Computation of yield tables for even-aged and two-storied stands. USDA Forest Serv., Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Exp. Sta., Res. Pap. RM-199. 26 p.

Hawksworth, F. G. 1977. The 6-class dwarf mistletoe rating system. USDA Forest Serv., Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Exp. Sta., Gen. Tech. Rep. 48. 7 p.

Johnson, D. W., F. G. Hawksworth, and L. M. Merrill. 1984. Ponderosa pine dwarf mistletoe loss assessment survey on National Forest lands in Colorado. USDA Forest Service, Forest Pest Manage. Tech. Rep. R-2 27. 13 p.

Merrill, L. M., F. G. Hawksworth, and D. W. Johnson. 1985. Evaluation of a roadside survey procedure for ponderosa pine in Colorado. Plant Disease 69 (in press).

# APPENDIX

TABLE 1.--Optimum prescriptions for RMYLD2 growth and yield simulations for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests' seedlings and saplings (SS)

| SSC[1] | AGE (yrs) | SITE INDEX | DMR[4] START (0-6) | PINF[4] START % | DMR[5] FINAL (0-6) | THIN1[4] (GSL) | DSTY1[4] (GSL) | DSTY2[4] (GSL) | DBH[5] CUT (in) | DBH[5] RESID. (in) | VOLUME OUT[5] MBF/AC | VOLUME OUT[5] MCF/AC | CULM. MAI[3] AGE (yrs) | CULM. MAI[3] $ft^3$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SS | 20 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 19.1 | 16.6 | 14.9 | 3.5 | 100 | 27 |
| | | | 0.2 | 16.5 | .0+ | 40 | 40 | 40 | 21.7 | 19.7 | 12.2 | 2.7 | 100 | 21 |
| | | | 0.7 | 49.5 | .0+ | 20 | 40 | 40 | 21.9 | 19.7 | 11.6 | 2.5 | 120 | 20 |
| (Regenerate)[2] | | | 2.6 | 82.5 | 6.0 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21.4 | 21.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 70 | 8 |
| SS | 20 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 20.4 | 18.0 | 17.9 | 4.1 | 100 | 32 |
| | | | 0.2 | 16.5 | .0+ | 40 | 60 | 60 | 20.4 | 17.8 | 17.5 | 4.0 | 110 | 31 |
| | | | 0.7 | 49.5 | .0+ | 40 | 40 | 40 | 22.9 | 20.7 | 14.3 | 3.2 | 100 | 25 |
| (Regenerate)[2] | | | 2.6 | 82.5 | 5.5 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 23.5 | 27.9 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 90 | 12 |
| SS | 20 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 70 | 70 | 20.5 | 18.0 | 23.8 | 5.6 | 100 | 43 |
| | | | 0.2 | 16.5 | .0+ | 40 | 60 | 60 | 21.4 | 19.1 | 21.5 | 4.8 | 100 | 37 |
| | | | 0.7 | 49.5 | .0+ | 40 | 50 | 50 | 22.6 | 20.3 | 19.5 | 4.3 | 100 | 33 |
| (Regenerate)[2] | | | 2.6 | 82.5 | 4.8 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 26.2 | 31.6 | 8.9 | 1.8 | 100 | 16 |

[1]SSC is stand size class.
[2]Unable to reduce dwarf mistletoe to acceptable levels; regenerate the stand.
[3]Culmination of mean annual increment.
[4]Input variables for data entry into RMYLD2; DMR START=DMR(1) stand dwarf mistletoe rating; PINF START=PINF(1) percent mistletoe infected; THIN1=growing stock level achieved with initial thinning; DSTY1 and 2=growing stock level or density achieved with subsequent entries. (Edminster 1978).
[5]Output from RMYLD2; DMR FINAL=stand dwarf mistletoe rating at rotation; DBH CUT=average diameter of sawtimber cut during the seedcut; DBH RESID.=average residual seedtree diameter; VOLUME OUT=commercial volume produced per acre.

TABLE 2.--Optimum prescriptions for RMYLD2 growth and yield simulations for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests' poletimber (PT)

| SSC[1] | AGE (yrs) | SITE INDEX | DMR[4] START (0-6) | PINF[4] START % | DMR[5] FINAL (0-6) | THIN1[4] (GSL) | DSTY1[4] (GSL) | DSTY2[4] (GSL) | DBH[5] CUT (in) | DBH[5] RESID. (in) | VOLUME OUT[5] MBF/AC | VOLUME OUT[5] MCF/AC | CULM. MAI.[3] AGE (yrs) | CULM. MAI.[3] ft³ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PT | 50 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 19.5 | 16.8 | 14.2 | 3.5 | 130 | 25 |
| | | | 0.2 | 16.5 | .0+ | 40 | 50 | 50 | 19.3 | 16.7 | 12.1 | 3.2 | 110 | 22 |
| | | | 0.7 | 49.5 | .0+ | 40 | 50 | 50 | 19.3 | 16.7 | 12.1 | 3.2 | 110 | 22 |
| (Regenerate)[2] | | | 2.6 | 82.5 | 4.5 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 22.3 | 27.6 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 120 | 12 |
| PT | 50 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 70 | 70 | 20.0 | 17.5 | 18.9 | 4.3 | 120 | 31 |
| | | | 0.2 | 16.5 | .0+ | 40 | 60 | 60 | 19.5 | 16.9 | 16.5 | 4.1 | 120 | 29 |
| | | | 0.7 | 49.5 | .0+ | 40 | 60 | 60 | 19.5 | 16.9 | 16.5 | 4.1 | 120 | 29 |
| (Regenerate)[2] | | | 2.6 | 82.5 | 3.9 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 23.5 | 28.2 | 7.8 | 2.1 | 120 | 15 |
| PT | 50 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 70 | 70 | 21.6 | 19.4 | 24.0 | 5.4 | 130 | 39 |
| | | | 0.2 | 16.5 | .0+ | 40 | 60 | 60 | 20.5 | 18.1 | 19.6 | 5.1 | 130 | 37 |
| | | | 0.7 | 49.5 | .0+ | 40 | 60 | 60 | 20.5 | 18.1 | 19.6 | 5.1 | 130 | 37 |
| (Regenerate)[2] | | | 2.6 | 82.5 | 2.8 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 23.1 | 27.0 | 12.1 | 3.4 | 130 | 25 |

[1]SSC is stand size class.
[2]Unable to reduce dwarf mistletoe to acceptable levels; regenerate the stand.
[3]Culmination of mean annual increment.
[4]Input variables for data entry into RMYLD2; DMR START=DMR(1) stand dwarf mistletoe rating; PINF START=PINF(1) percent mistletoe infected; THIN1=growing stock level achieved with initial thinning; DSTY1 and 2=growing stock level or density achieved with subsequent entries. (Edminster, 1978).
[5]Output from RMYLD; DMR FINAL=stand dwarf mistletoe rating at rotation; DBH CUT=average diameter of sawtimber cut during the seedcut; DBH RESID.=average residual seedtree diameter; VOLUME OUT=commercial volume produced per acre.

TABLE 3.--Dwarf mistletoe infection severity estimates by stand size class for Districts on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests

| RANGER DISTRICT: | | STAND SIZE CLASS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SEEDLINGS/SAPLINGS | | | | POLETIMBER | | | | SAWTIMBER | | | | OVERMATURE | | | |
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3[1] | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| SPRINGERVILLE | MI[2] | 3.9 | 0.7 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 8.8 | 6.1 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 3.8 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| | %[3] | 48 | 9 | 42 | 1 | 26 | 18 | 27 | 29 | 45 | 6 | 16 | 33 | 38 | 9 | 23 | 30 |
| LAKESIDE | MI | 69.5 | 16.1 | 12.9 | 22.0 | 32.2 | 3.0 | 12.2 | 8.1 | 15.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | % | 58 | 13 | 11 | 18 | 58 | 5 | 22 | 15 | 89 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ALPINE | MI | 34.6 | 16.1 | 13.5 | 5.1 | 39.6 | 12.1 | 26.2 | 15.5 | 15.4 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 3.5 | 12.9 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 1.8 |
| | % | 50 | 23 | 19 | 7 | 42 | 13 | 28 | 17 | 62 | 7 | 17 | 14 | 52 | 21 | 20 | 7 |
| HEBER | MI | 38.8 | 9.7 | 18.9 | 37.5 | 31.0 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 24.2 | 34.1 | 2.6 | 4.0 | 9.9 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 0.7 |
| | % | 37 | 9 | 18 | 36 | 47 | 8 | 9 | 37 | 67 | 5 | 8 | 20 | 26 | 2 | 57 | 15 |
| CHEVELON | MI | 36.9 | 9.4 | 19.4 | 12.6 | 7.3 | 3.7 | 15.9 | 21.1 | 30.4 | 4.3 | 17.4 | 7.9 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 7.2 |
| | % | 47 | 12 | 25 | 16 | 15 | 8 | 33 | 44 | 51 | 7 | 29 | 13 | 24 | 3 | 11 | 62 |
| FOREST TOTALS | MI | 183.7 | 52.0 | 68.1 | 77.3 | 118.9 | 30.0 | 68.8 | 78.6 | 99.2 | 9.7 | 27.6 | 24.9 | 19.2 | 6.2 | 10.1 | 11.4 |
| | % | 48 | 14 | 18 | 20 | 40 | 10 | 23 | 27 | 62 | 6 | 17 | 15 | 41 | 13 | 22 | 24 |

[1]Dwarf mistletoe infection severity level.
[2]Miles of road surveyed in stands of a particular size class and infection severity level.
[3]Percentages are computed within the stand size class for a single District, and are rounded up to nearest whole percentage.

TABLE 4.--Comparison of dwarf mistletoe infection severity levels between Districts on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests

| RANGER DISTRICT: | | DWARF MISTLETOE INFECTION SEVERITY | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DM(-)[1] | DM(+)[2] | DM1[5] | DM2[5] | DM3[5] | SUBTOTAL |
| SPRINGERVILLE | MI[6] | 18.6 | 38.2 | 7.8 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 56.8[3] |
| | %[7] | 33 | 67 | 14 | 26 | 27 | 6[4] |
| LAKESIDE | MI | 117.4 | 76.2 | 19.7 | 25.6 | 30.9 | 193.6[3] |
| | % | 61 | 39 | 10 | 13 | 16 | 22[4] |
| ALPINE | MI | 103.4 | 109.8 | 35.0 | 48.9 | 25.9 | 213.2[3] |
| | % | 49 | 51 | 16 | 23 | 12 | 24[4] |
| HEBER | MI | 105.1 | 121.1 | 17.5 | 31.3 | 72.3 | 226.2[3] |
| | % | 46 | 54 | 8 | 14 | 32 | 26[4] |
| CHEVELON | MI | 77.4 | 120.6 | 17.8 | 54.0 | 48.8 | 198.0[3] |
| | % | 39 | 61 | 9 | 27 | 25 | 22[4] |
| FOREST TOTALS | MI | 421.9 | 465.9 | 97.8 | 174.8 | 193.3 | 887.7 |
| | % | 48 | 52 | 11 | 20 | 22 | 100 |

[1]Miles of ponderosa pine stands surveyed without dwarf mistletoe infection.
[2]Miles of ponderosa pine stands surveyed with dwarf mistletoe infection of severity level (1, 2, or 3).
[3]Miles surveyed in a District.
[4]Percentage of Forest-wide survey miles.
[5]Dwarf mistletoe infection severity level.
[6]Miles surveyed in stands within a District and infection severity level.
[7]Percentage of total miles surveyed in a District within an infection severity level.

TABLE 5.--Dwarf mistletoe incidence by visual quality class for Districts on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests

| RANGER DISTRICT | DM | FR[1] | | OR[1] | | FPR[1] | | 3PR[1] | | OPR[1] | | 3M[1] | | OM[1] | | SUBTOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (-)[2] | (+)[3] | (-) | (+) | (-) | (+) | (-) | (+) | (-) | (+) | (-) | (+) | (-) | (+) | (-) | (+) |
| SPRINGERVILLE | MI[4] | 1.8 | 9.3 | 2.7 | 6.0 | 1.8 | 4.7 | | | 12.2 | 17.7 | | | 0.1 | 0.5 | 18.6 | 38.2 |
| | %[5] | 16 | 84 | 31 | 69 | 28 | 72 | | | 41 | 59 | | | 17 | 83 | 33 | 67 |
| LAKESIDE | MI | 33.4 | 10.2 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 18.7 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 62.6 | 37 | | | 6.7 | 4.3 | 117.4 | 76.2 |
| | % | 77 | 23 | 60 | 40 | 22 | 78 | 66 | 34 | 63 | 37 | | | 61 | 39 | 61 | 39 |
| ALPINE | MI | 43.8 | 21.2 | 13.1 | 23.7 | 13.1 | 13.3 | 0.5 | 0 | 22.0 | 29.9 | 0.8 | 3.9 | 10.1 | 17.8 | 103.4 | 109.8 |
| | % | 67 | 33 | 36 | 64 | 49 | 51 | 100 | 0 | 42 | 58 | 17 | 83 | 36 | 64 | 49 | 51 |
| HEBER | MI | 25.9 | 34.8 | 1.4 | 3.3 | 13.3 | 12.2 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 34.6 | 49.4 | 15.3 | 9.7 | 13.1 | 10.8 | 105.1 | 121.1 |
| | % | 43 | 57 | 30 | 70 | 52 | 48 | 63 | 37 | 41 | 59 | 61 | 39 | 55 | 45 | 46 | 54 |
| CHEVELON | MI | 2.5 | 13.5 | 4.0 | 23.7 | 8.8 | 15.7 | 8.1 | 16.1 | 1.6 | 7.3 | 2.2 | 7.0 | 50.5 | 37.3 | 77.4 | 120.6 |
| | % | 16 | 84 | 14 | 86 | 36 | 64 | 33 | 67 | 18 | 82 | 24 | 76 | 57 | 43 | 39 | 61 |
| FOREST TOTALS | MI | 107.4 | 89.0 | 28.0 | 61.3 | 42.2 | 64.6 | 12.8 | 18.4 | 133.0 | 141.3 | 18.3 | 20.6 | 80.2 | 70.7 | 421.9 | 465.9 |
| | % | 55 | 45 | 31 | 69 | 40 | 60 | 41 | 59 | 48 | 52 | 47 | 53 | 53 | 47 | 48 | 52 |

[1]Visual quality classes (see page 4 for an explanation of abbreviations).
[2]Surveyed stands without dwarf mistletoe infection.
[3]Surveyed stands with dwarf mistletoe infection of severity level 1, 2, or 3.
[4]Miles of road surveyed in stands within a District, in a given visual quality class.
[5]Percentage of total miles of road surveyed within a District, in a given visual quality class.

TABLE 6.--Comparison of dwarf mistletoe infection severity estimates by visual quality class for Districts on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests

| RANGER DISTRICT | DM | FR[1] 0 | FR[1] 1 | FR[1] 2 | FR[1] 3[2] | OR[1] 0 | OR[1] 1 | OR[1] 2 | OR[1] 3 | FPR[1] 0 | FPR[1] 1 | FPR[1] 2 | FPR[1] 3 | 3PR[1] 0 | 3PR[1] 1 | 3PR[1] 2 | 3PR[1] 3 | OPR[1] 0 | OPR[1] 1 | OPR[1] 2 | OPR[1] 3 | 3M[1] 0 | 3M[1] 1 | 3M[1] 2 | 3M[1] 3 | OM[1] 0 | OM[1] 1 | OM[1] 2 | OM[1] 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SPRINGERVILLE | MI[3] | 1.8 | 1.5 | 4.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.3 | | | | | 12.2 | 3.8 | 7.1 | 6.8 | | | | | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | |
| | %[4] | 16 | 14 | 43 | 27 | 31 | 15 | 8 | 46 | 28 | 14 | 34 | 25 | | | | | 41 | 13 | 24 | 23 | | | | | 17 | 50 | 33 | |
| LAKESIDE | MI | 33.4 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 5.5 | 6.8 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 5.2 | 5.9 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 62.6 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 17.9 | | | | | 6.7 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.2 |
| | % | 77 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 60 | 4 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 25 | 32 | 21 | 66 | 15 | 17 | 2 | 63 | 9 | 10 | 18 | | | | | 61 | 18 | 19 | 2 |
| ALPINE | MI | 43.8 | 4.4 | 11.9 | 4.9 | 13.1 | 3.6 | 13.6 | 6.5 | 13.1 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 2.1 | 0.5 | | | | 22.0 | 11.3 | 10.5 | 8.1 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 10.1 | 8.4 | 5.7 | 3.7 |
| | % | 67 | 7 | 18 | 8 | 36 | 10 | 37 | 18 | 49 | 21 | 20 | 8 | 100 | | | | 42 | 22 | 20 | 16 | 17 | 34 | 36 | 13 | 36 | 30 | 20 | 13 |
| HEBER | MI | 25.9 | 5.7 | 7.2 | 21.9 | 1.4 | | 0.2 | 3.1 | 13.3 | 2.3 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 1.5 | | 0.7 | 0.2 | 34.6 | 5.1 | 12.4 | 31.9 | 15.3 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 13.1 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 6.6 |
| | % | 43 | 9 | 12 | 36 | 30 | | 4 | 66 | 52 | 9 | 18 | 20 | 63 | | 29 | 8 | 41 | 6 | 15 | 38 | 61 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 55 | 4 | 14 | 28 |
| CHEVELON | MI | 2.5 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 8.2 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 9.3 | 12.4 | 8.8 | 1.1 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 8.1 | 3.3 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.2 | | 3.9 | 3.1 | 50.2 | 9.5 | 18.9 | 8.9 |
| | % | 16 | 4 | 29 | 51 | 14 | 7 | 34 | 45 | 36 | 4 | 30 | 30 | 33 | 14 | 28 | 25 | 18 | 15 | 35 | 33 | 24 | | 42 | 34 | 57 | 11 | 22 | 10 |
| FOREST TOTALS | MI | 107.4 | 13.8 | 31.7 | 43.5 | 28.0 | 7.4 | 25.8 | 28.1 | 42.2 | 15.9 | 27.4 | 21.3 | 12.8 | 3.9 | 8.2 | 6.3 | 133.0 | 30.6 | 43.1 | 67.6 | 18.3 | 5.1 | 8.4 | 7.1 | 80.2 | 21.1 | 30.2 | 19.4 |
| | % | 55 | 7 | 16 | 22 | 31 | 8 | 29 | 31 | 40 | 15 | 26 | 20 | 41 | 13 | 26 | 20 | 48 | 11 | 16 | 25 | 47 | 13 | 22 | 18 | 53 | 14 | 20 | 13 |

[1]Visual quality class (see page 4 for explanation of abbreviations).
[2]Dwarf mistletoe infection severity level.
[3]Miles of road surveyed in stands within Districts, visual quality classes, and infection severity levels.
[4]Percentage of total miles surveyed within a District and visual quality class.

TABLE 7.--Summary of Chi-square analyses comparing observed and expected mistletoe incidence[1] by stand size classes and visual quality classes (P=0.05)

| | | STAND SIZE CLASSES | | | | VISUAL QUALITY CLASSES | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RANGER DISTRICT: | | SS[3] | PT[3] | ST[3] | OT[3] | FR[4] | OR[4] | FPR[4] | 3PR[4] | OPR[4] | 3M[4] | OM[4] |
| SPRINGERVILLE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $(O_i-E_i)$ | MI[5] | -0.8 | +2.3 | -1.0 | -0.3 | +1.9 | +0.2 | +0.3 | | -2.3 | | +0.1 |
| | SIG.[2] | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | | NS | | NS |
| LAKESIDE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MI | +4.0 | +1.7 | -4.9 | | -6.8 | +0.2 | +9.4 | -0.2 | -1.8 | | 0 |
| | SIG. | NS | NS | NS | | S | NS | S | NS | NS | | NS |
| ALPINE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MI | -1.3 | +2.2 | -3.5 | -1.0 | -12.6 | +4.6 | -0.4 | -0.3 | 0 | +1.5 | +3.0 |
| | SIG. | NS | NS | NS | NS | S | S | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| HEBER | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MI | +9.5 | -0.6 | -10.8 | +0.9 | +2.0 | +0.8 | -1.6 | -0.4 | +4.0 | -3.8 | +5.0 |
| | SIG. | S | NS | S | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| CHEVELON | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MI | -6.4 | +11.5 | -10.0 | +1.8 | +13.7 | +6.8 | +0.9 | +5.3 | +1.9 | +1.4 | -16.0 |
| | SIG . | S | S | S | NS | S | S | NS | S | NS | NS | S |
| FOREST-WIDE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MI | -8.0 | +20.4 | -21.7 | +3.3 | -13.1 | +14.9 | +9.1 | +2.2 | -4.3 | +0.4 | -8.0 |
| | SIG. | NS | S | S | NS | S | S | S | NS | NS | NS | NS |

[1]Dwarf mistletoe incidence is presented as miles of stands surveyed with any mistletoe infection, by stand size class, visual quality class, and District.
[2]Denotes significance at P=0.05; NS is not significant, S is significant.
[3]SS=seedling and sapling stands; PT=poletimber stands; ST=sawtimber stands; OT=overmature stands.
[4](See page 4 for an explanation of abbreviations).
[5]Difference between the observed ($O_i$) number of miles of road surveyed with mistletoe infection and the expected ($E_i$) number of miles with mistletoe infection as predicted by the Chi-square distribution.

TABLE 8.--Minimum estimate[1] of annual losses in sawtimber and pulpwood production on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests

| RANGER DISTRICT | | SEEDLINGS AND SAPLINGS (SS) | | POLETIMBER (PT) | | SAWTIMBER (ST) | | OVERMATURE TIMBER (OT) | | SUBTOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | MMBF/YR | MMCF/YR | MMBF/YR | MMCF/YR | MMBF/YR | MMCF/YR | MMBF/YR | MMCF/YR | MMBF/YR | MMCF/YR |
| SPRINGERVILLE | VOL. | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | .0+ | 1.9 | 0.4 |
| | %[2] | 21 | 25 | 47 | 50 | 26 | 25 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| LAKESIDE | VOL. | 2.5 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 | 1.0 |
| | % | 57 | 60 | 36 | 30 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| ALPINE | VOL. | 2.0 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | .0+ | 5.4 | 1.1 |
| | % | 37 | 45 | 41 | 36 | 19 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 16 |
| HEBER | VOL. | 5.3 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 10.5 | 2.4 |
| | % | 51 | 54 | 34 | 29 | 11 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 34 | 34 |
| CHEVELON | VOL. | 2.7 | 0.7 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 8.7 | 2.1 |
| | % | 31 | 33 | 48 | 43 | 12 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 28 | 30 |
| FOREST TOTAL | VOL. | 12.9 | 3.2 | 12.5 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 30.9 | 7.0 |
| | % | 42 | 46 | 40 | 36 | 13 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 100 | 100 |

[1]Estimates based on RMYLD2 growth and yield projections using incidence and severity data from the survey.
[2]Percentage of District losses in a stand size class.

FIGURE 1. Comparison of DM Incidence between Districts and the trend towards increased infection severity



FIGURE 2. Comparison of observed and expected DM incidence by size class for the Apache-Sitgreaves N.F.'s



FIGURE 3. Comparison of observed and expected DM incidence by visual quality class for the Apache–Sitgreaves N.F.'s



FIGURE 4. Distribution of projected annual volume losses by size class for the Apache–Sitgreaves N.F.'s



FIGURE 5. Increase in dwarf mistletoe incidence in commercial ponderosa pine stands on the Apache–Sitgreaves N.F.'s from 1960–1983




PROPORTION OF TOTAL NO. OF STANDS




FIGURE 6.--Record of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey of the Apache National Forest-Springerville District

FIGURE 7.--Record of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey of the Apache National Forest-Alpine District






FIGURE 8.--Record of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey of the Apache National Forest-Alpine District

FIGURE 9.--Record of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey of the Sitgreaves National Forest-Chevelon District






FIGURE 10.--Record of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey of the Sitgreaves National Forest-Heber District




FIGURE 11.--Record of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey of the Sitgreaves National Forest-Heber and Lakeside Districts




FIGURE 12.--Record of the 1983 dwarf mistletoe survey of the Sitgreaves National Forest-Lakeside District